

EVOLUTION OF BINARY COMPACT OBJECTS WHICH MERGE

HANS A. BETHE

Floyd R. Newman Laboratory of Nuclear Studies

Cornell University

Ithaca, New York 14853, USA

G. E. BROWN

Department of Physics and Astronomy

State University of New York

Stony Brook, New York 11794-3800, USA

Received _____; accepted _____

ABSTRACT

Beginning from massive binaries in the Galaxy we evolve black–hole, neutron–star binaries and binary neutron stars, such as the Hulse–Taylor system PSR 1913+16. The new point in our evolution is a quantitative calculation of the accretion of matter by a neutron star in common envelope evolution which sends it into a black hole. We calculate the mass of the latter to be $\sim 2.4 M_{\odot}$.

The black hole fate of the first neutron star can only be avoided if the neutron star does not go through common envelope evolution. This can be realized if the two massive binaries are sufficiently close in mass, not more than $\sim 5\%$ apart, so that they burn helium at the same time. Then their common hydrogen envelope is expelled by the tightening in the double He–star system, with attendant hydrodynamical coupling to the envelope. In this way we obtain a rate of $\lesssim 10^{-5}$ per year per Galaxy for production of the narrow neutron–star binaries such as the Hulse–Taylor 1913+16 or the Wolszczan 1934+12. This is in agreement with estimates based on the observed number of such systems extrapolated to the entire Galaxy with beaming factors and corrections for the $\sim 90\%$ of the binary pulsars estimated to be unobservable.

Our chief conclusion is that the production rate for black–hole, neutron–star binaries (in which the neutron star is unrecycled) is $\sim 10^{-4}$ per year per Galaxy, an order of magnitude greater than that of neutron star binaries. Not only should this result in a factor of ~ 10 more mergings for gravitational wave detectors like LIGO, but the signal should be larger.

We give some discussion of why black–hole, neutron–star binaries have not been observed, but conclude that they should be actively searched for.

Subject headings: black holes – compact objects – mergers – gravitational waves

1. INTRODUCTION

LIGO, an elaborate system of detectors, is being prepared to measure gravitational waves. It is generally believed that the best source of such waves is the merger of two compact stars, neutron stars (NS) or black holes (BH). It is therefore useful to predict the frequency of such mergers.

The current belief is that there are about 10^{-5} mergers per Galaxy per year. We wish to show that the rate is about 10 times greater, of order 10^{-4} per Galaxy per year.

We wish to show that a substantial fraction of supernovae in binary stars will head in time to two compact stars which will ultimately merge. Our assumptions are listed in §2.

In §3 we estimate the fraction of binaries which contain two stars massive enough to become supernovae provided they contain one. We find this fraction to be about 50%.

The most likely way in which a binary of interest may be disrupted is by the kick which the NS receives in the two SN (supernovae). We use recent observations by Chernoff and Cordes (1997) of pulsar velocities, and find that about 40% of binaries survive that kick (§2).

We find (§4) that in 80% of the binaries of interest, the first SN, in star A , occurs while the other star (B) is still in its main sequence (MS). Subsequently star B evolves into a giant. The NS, A , will accrete part of the envelope of B and thereby becomes a BH. The rest of the envelope of B will be ejected, the energy for this being provided by A spiralling in (§4). We require that A stay outside the He core of star B , so that we ultimately get two separate compact stars. This depends importantly on A becoming a BH.

In the 20% of cases where B is already a giant when A becomes a SN, the evolution is somewhat more complicated (§6). In the fraction of these cases where stars A and B burn helium at the same time, the first neutron star can escape common envelope

evolution and so avoid going into a black hole. In these cases, a neutron–star binary such as the Hulse–Taylor 1913+16 can be formed, with total production probability for narrow neutron–star binaries which merge of $\sim 10^{-5}$ per year per Galaxy.

In §7, we determine the maximum distance R between the two compact stars which will permit merger by gravitational wave emission within a Hubble time. Essentially all cases we discuss will permit such merger.

We conclude (§8) that $\sim 1\%$ of all SN in binary stars will lead ultimately to mergers; thus we predict 10^{-4} mergers per Galaxy per year.

2. ASSUMPTIONS

We call the star which is initially heavier, star A , the other star B . We denote initial masses by subscript O , so we have masses M_{AO} , M_{BO} . We denote their ratio by q , thus

$$q = M_{BO}/M_{AO} \leq 1 \quad . \quad (2.1)$$

Following Portegies Zwart and Yungelson (1998), we assume that q is distributed uniformly between 0 and 1. Likewise following them, we assume that $\log a$ is uniformly distributed where a is the semi-major axis of their orbit.

However, we assume different limits for a than they. Initially both stars are massive main sequence stars, radius at least $3 R_{\odot}$, so $a > 6R_{\odot} = 4 \times 10^6$ km. At the other end, we require $a < 4 \times 10^9$ km. This corresponds to an orbital velocity of 30 km s^{-1} , the same as the earth around the sun, and an orbital period of 25 years. At a smaller orbital velocity (longer period), it would be difficult to recognize the stars as a binary. Then the fraction of binaries in a given interval of $\ell n a$ is

$$d\phi = d(\ell n a)/7 \quad . \quad (2.2)$$

In fact, our lower limit is too low since two ZAMS early B stars of $8 M_{\odot}$ each would fill their Roche lobes in an orbit of $9R_{\odot}$ rather than $6R_{\odot}$. Thus 10^7 km would be more reasonable. Furthermore, as Eggleton (1998) also pointed out, our flat distribution over $\log P$ is not well supported for massive stars. Garmany, Conti & Massey (1980) did probably the best analysis so far and found a binarity of $36 \pm 7\%$ O-stars in a magnitude-limited and declination-limited sample of 67 O-stars. Longer periods are largely inaccessible to measurement because of the inherent instability of O-stars. Although the observed binarity is smaller than our assumed 50%, the logarithmic interval in a is also smaller so that the number of binaries in a given logarithmic interval is not much changed. Unfortunately, the interval a_i which we find useful in eq. (5.24) presumably includes some of the inaccessible binaries. In the work referred to there is a clustering of observed binaries in the period interval $\sim 3 - 10$ days, as compared with $\sim 10 - 100$ days which we show below to be favorable for gravitational merging with avoidance of in-spiral. However, orbits widen during mass transfer (RLOF) as we show below in our eq. (6.1), and the shorter period stars will mostly widen into our favorable interval. Thus, we believe our flat distribution over $\log P$ with chosen interval and binarity to somewhat underestimate the number of favorable binaries.

We assume that a star needs an initial mass

$$M > M_S = 10M_{\odot} \quad , \quad (2.3)$$

to become a supernova. Beyond this mass, we assume that the rate of birth of stars of mass M is proportional to

$$\beta \sim M^{-n} \quad , \quad (2.4)$$

where n is the Salpeter exponent, about 1.5. The rate of supernovae (SN) is the same as the rate of birth. So if α is the total rate of SN, the rate of SN in a mass interval dM is

$$d\alpha = \alpha n (M/10M_{\odot})^{-n} dM/M \quad . \quad (2.5)$$

We assume the total rate of supernova (SN) events per Galaxy to be

$$\alpha' = 2 \text{ per century} = 2 \times 10^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1} . \quad (2.6)$$

We assume that half¹ the stars are in binaries, so the rate of supernova events in binaries is

$$\alpha = 1 \times 10^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1} . \quad (2.7)$$

In the SN event, the resulting neutron star (NS) receives a kick. For the distribution of kicks, we take the measurements of Cordes and Chernoff (1997). They found that the distribution is well represented by the sum of two Gaussians with different standard dispersion σ

$$\begin{aligned} 80\% \text{ have } \sigma_1 &= 175 \text{ km s}^{-1} \\ 20\% \text{ have } \sigma_2 &= 700 \text{ km s}^{-1} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

If v is the orbital velocity of the star which is becoming a supernova, and U is the kick given to the supernova remnant, a rough approximation to the probability of the binary remaining together is²

$$\omega = \frac{v^2}{U^2 + v^2} . \quad (2.9)$$

If the kicks are distributed in a Gaussian, it is a fair approximation to replace U by σ , so

$$\omega' = \frac{v^2}{\sigma^2 + v^2} . \quad (2.10)$$

¹With our smaller interval in a we may be overestimating the binarity somewhat.

²Computer calculations with the program of Wettig and Brown (1996) show this approximation to be accurate to $\leq 10\%$ in the region of appreciable survival probabilities. Survival with the Chernoff and Cordes parameterization is slightly greater than that with the formula of Portegies Zwart and Yungelson (1998).

Now for a binary of total mass $M = M_A + M_B$, in a circular orbit of radius a , the orbital velocity is

$$v^2 = GMa^{-1} \quad . \quad (2.11)$$

So if $\log a$ is uniformly distributed, then $\log v^2$ is likewise, and

$$d\phi = \frac{d(v^2)}{7v^2} \quad , \quad (2.12)$$

with limits on v^2 as indicated in the paragraph below eq. (2.1), i.e.,

$$30 \text{ km s}^{-1} < v < 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1} \quad . \quad (2.13)$$

Then the fraction of all binaries surviving the first supernova event is

$$\mathcal{W} = \int \omega' d\phi = \frac{1}{7} \int \frac{d(v^2)}{\sigma^2 + v^2} = \frac{1}{7} \ln \frac{\sigma^2 + v_{\max}^2}{\sigma^2 + v_{\min}^2} \quad , \quad (2.14)$$

where $v_{\max}$ and $v_{\min}$ are the limits indicated in (2.13). Taking into account the kick distribution (2.8),

$$\mathcal{W} = \frac{0.8}{7} \ln \frac{10^2 + 1.75^2}{0.3^2 + 1.75^2} + \frac{0.2}{7} \ln \frac{10^2 + 7^2}{0.3^2 + 7^2} = 0.43 \quad . \quad (2.15)$$

Note that the minimum velocity, 30 km s^{-1} , is unimportant. Changing this to 10 km s^{-1} alters the result in (2.15) by only 10%. The maximum orbital velocity, i.e., the minimum orbital radius, is relevant. The high kick velocities, σ_2 , contribute only 0.03 of the 0.43 in eq. (2.15). The rate of formation of binaries that survive the first supernova event is now 0.43 per century.

A small correction should be made for the fact that the hydrogen envelope in star A does not generally extend out to the larger a in our assumed interval. Weaver, Zimmerman & Woosley (1978) find that for a $15 \text{ M}_{\odot}$ star (star A) the envelope reaches out to $3.9 \times 10^8 \text{ km}$ in supergiant stage. Taking $M_B = 10 \text{ M}_{\odot}$, we find the Roche lobe to be $\sim 1/3$ of the distance between A and B . Thus, Roche Lobe overflow takes place only out to $a \lesssim 1.2 \times 10^9$

km in this example, less than our 4×10^9 km upper limit. However, relatively few systems at the higher a survive the kick velocities and we estimate the correction to be $\sim 10\%$, which we neglect.

It should also be noted that we have assumed the semi-major axis distribution to be flat in $\log a$ following mass transfer, whereas the empirical determinations of it are before mass transfer. From rough estimates this seems to be a valid assumption. We neglect all binaries which do not survive the first phase of mass transfer and merge into single objects. From Portegies Zwart and Verbunt (1996), Table 4, this is about 20%. We have not made this correction because in our calculations the close binaries do not survive in-spiral.

3. MASS TRANSFER

The more massive star A becomes a giant after time t_A . Its Roche lobe overflows and matter is transferred to star B . This continues until A is stripped of its hydrogen envelope and thus reduced to a He star. In the mass range we are considering, M_{AO} between 10 and perhaps $50 M_\odot$, the mass of the remaining He star is roughly 30% of the initial mass. Using a more accurate relation does not appreciably change our results. Denoting masses after this first transfer by subscript 1,

$$M_{A1} = 0.3M_{AO} \quad . \quad (3.1)$$

Only part of the mass lost by A will be attached to B . We adopt the estimate by Vrancken, DeGreve, Yungelson and Tutukov (1991) (VDYT), that the fraction attached to B is

$$\beta \approx (M_{BO}/M_{AO})^2 = q^2 \quad . \quad (3.2)$$

(VDYT use the exponent 1.84). Thus after transfer, the mass of B is

$$M_{B1} = (q + 0.7q^2) M_{AO} \equiv M_{AO}f(q) \quad . \quad (3.3)$$

For $q = 1$, the transfer is conservative, and $f(q) = 1.7$. For $q < 0.68$, $f(q) < 1$.

We wish both stars to become supernovae at some stage in their life. For star A , the condition is

$$M_{AO} > M_{\text{sup}} = 10M_{\odot} \quad . \quad (3.4)$$

It is here assumed that the minimum mass for a (type II or Ib) supernova is $10M_{\odot}$. For star B to become a supernova, we require that $M_{B1} > 10M_{\odot}$, in other words

$$f(q) > 10M_{\odot}/M_{AO} \quad . \quad (3.5)$$

We have assumed that q is distributed uniformly between 0 and 1, so the probability that star B also becomes a SN, for any given M_{AO} , is $1 - q_a$, where

$$f(q_a) = 10M_{\odot}/M_{AO} \quad . \quad (3.6)$$

Portegies Zwart and Verbunt (1996) give in their Table 4 results for other distributions in q .

The rate of supernovae in a given mass interval dM_{AO} is given by (2.5), hence the rate of birth of binaries that have supernovae in *both* stars is

$$\alpha'' = \alpha n \int_{10M_{\odot}}^{50M_{\odot}} \left(\frac{10M_{\odot}}{M_{AO}} \right)^n \frac{dM_{AO}}{M_{AO}} [1 - q_a(M_{AO})] \quad . \quad (3.7)$$

The upper limit has been taken to be $50 M_{\odot}$ because above this mass stars tend to lose their envelope mass in a luminous blue variable stage, and become Wolf-Rayets. They cannot then participate in common envelope evolution. We have evaluated the integral numerically and find

$$\alpha'' = .50 \alpha \quad . \quad (3.8)$$

This value varies $\lesssim 10\%$ with different reasonable Salpeter exponents (Lattimer, 1997).

4. EVOLUTION

For masses near and above $10M_{\odot}$, the lifetime of a star in the main sequence is about proportional to M^{-2} . Thus, when star A has come to the end of its main sequence life, after time t_A , star B will have gone through a fraction q^2 of its main sequence lifetime.

The evolution time from the beginning of He burning to supernova is roughly one-tenth of the main sequence evolution time. This time is relevant for us because mass will generally be transferred during helium core burning, the supergiant state, when the hydrogen envelope is greatly extended. During this time $0.1t_A$, star B has a mass $M_{AO}f(q)$, so it will go through an added fraction $0.1f^2(q)$ of its main sequence life. At the end of this, the fraction of its main sequence life accomplished by star B is

$$g(q) = q^2 + 0.1f^2(q) \quad . \quad (4.1)$$

Table I gives the functions $f(q)$ and $g(q)$. An approximate formula is

$$g(q) = 1.25q^2 \pm 0.02 \quad . \quad (4.2)$$

Of special interest is the value of q for which $g(q) = 1$. It is

$$q_1 = 0.8897 \quad . \quad (4.3)$$

The evolution is different according as $q < q_1$ or $q > q_1$. For $q < q_1$, we have Case I: Star B is still in its main sequence when star A becomes a supernova. The evolution in this case will be treated in §5. In Case II, $q > q_1$, star B will be a giant when star A has its supernova event, this will be treated in §6.

The probability, for any M_{AO} , that $q > q_1$ is

$$1 - q_1 = 0.110 \quad , \quad (4.4)$$

so the rate of getting a case II binary is

$$\alpha(II) = 0.11\alpha \quad , \quad (4.5)$$

which is about 20% of the total rate, (3.8).

5. CASE I: STAR B IN MAIN SEQUENCE

5.1. Possible Appearance

As discussed in §4, Case I will hold if the initial mass ratio

$$q = M_{BO}/M_{AO} < q_1 \approx 0.89 \quad . \quad (5.1)$$

As shown after eq. (4.5), this applies to 80% of all SN binaries. After star A has had its supernova event, and provided the binary stayed together (see §2), we have a neutron star A and a main sequence star B of mass $M_{B1} = M_{AO}f(q)$ which must be greater than $10M_{\odot}$ because we want B ultimately to become a supernova. So B will be a B - or O -star. The total lifetime of such stars is of order 10^7 years. A will be a neutron star, but it will be a pulsar only for $5 \cdot 10^6$ years or less because its spin will diminish by emitting pulsar radiation. In fact, the binary 1259–63 with a Be star companion and 0045–73 with a B star companion contain radio pulsars. The former has a short 47 ms period and a double pulse profile similar to the Crab; *i.e.*, it is a young pulsar. The latter binary is in the small Magellanic cloud and is the most luminous binary radio pulsar known.

Since the pulsar is unrecycled, the expected number of these binaries should be compared with the single neutron star pulsar population, about 700 in number, with more uncataloged. This number should be multiplied by a factor $\sim 1/2$ for binarity and a factor of 0.43 (Eq. (2.15)) for breakup in the first explosion. This would leave the large number ~ 150 if pulsars with massive companions were as easily observable as single pulsars. Of

course, pulsars are predominantly produced in the Galactic disc and, because of the strong gravitational attraction of the dense matter in the disc, those with massive companions will be unable to move out of the disc. Stellar winds can interfere with the radio pulses from these binaries, obscuring the narrower ones. Nonetheless, the factor necessary to reduce their observability is startlingly large. We return to this later.

5.2. Structure of a Giant

A giant has a He core, containing some 25% of its mass, surrounded by an envelope consisting mostly of H. The envelope is usually in convection so the entropy is constant. The particles, nuclei and electrons, are non-relativistic and thus have $\gamma = 5/3$, therefore the envelope forms a polytrope of index $n = 3/2$. Applegate (1997) has shown that the binding energy of the envelope is

$$E_1 \cong (3/5)GM_B^2 R^{-1} \quad , \quad (5.2)$$

where R is the outer radius. In this formula the gravitational binding energy is decreased by 50% by the kinetic energy, E_1 containing both effects.

After exhaustion of the core hydrogen, the radius R increases first slowly, then more rapidly, until it settles down (for masses in our range) at several times 10^{13} cm.

5.3. Accretion

Star A , beginning as a neutron star of mass $1.4 M_\odot$, sits at a distance r_A from the center of star B , awaiting the latter to expand into a giant. Its orbital period is a small fraction of the time required for B to evolve into a giant (which is of order 10^5 years). When B reaches the radius r_A , material from B begins to accrete to A . The rate of accretion is

given by the Bondi-Hoyle-Lyttleton theory,

$$dM_A/dt = \pi \rho v R_{ac}^2 \quad , \quad (5.3)$$

where ρ is the density of the B -material, v its velocity relative to A , and R_{ac} the accretion radius

$$R_{ac} = 2GM_A v^{-2} \quad . \quad (5.4)$$

Here v is the velocity of the B material relative to A , which is essentially the orbital velocity of A around B . This is

$$v^2 = G(M_B + M_A)a^{-1} \quad . \quad (5.5)$$

The energy loss is related to the accretion rate by (Iben & Livio, 1993; Brown, 1995)

$$\dot{E} = \frac{1}{2} c_d v^2 \dot{M}_A \quad . \quad (5.6)$$

Here c_d is the drag coefficient (Shima, *et al.*, 1985),

$$c_d = 2\ell n(b_{\max}/b_{\min}) \approx 6 \quad , \quad (5.7)$$

for highly supersonic flow. (Iben and Livio, 1993, use $c_d = 8$.) Here $b_{\max}$ and $b_{\min}$ are the maximum and minimum impact parameters of the envelope material relative to the neutron star. Note that if c_d decreases as the envelope moves towards corotation with the neutron star, the c_d in (5.6) must be replaced (Brown, 1995) by an effective coefficient of drag

$$(c_d)_{eff} = c_d \left(\frac{\mathcal{M}^2 + 1}{\mathcal{M}^2} \right)^{3/2}$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is the Mach number v/c_s , with c_s the speed of sound. The drop in $(c_d)_{eff}$ with decreasing Mach number is slower than in c_d .

The interaction energy of the two stars is

$$E = \frac{1}{2} G M_A M_B a^{-1} \quad , \quad (5.8)$$

where a is the semi-major axis of the orbit. $(-E)$ is the sum of potential and kinetic (orbital) energy. The orbital velocity is given by (5.5). Generally, $M_A \ll M_B$, and we shall neglect M_A in (5.5). Inserting (5.5) into (5.6),

$$\dot{E} = \frac{1}{2} c_d G M_B a^{-1} \dot{M}_A \quad . \quad (5.9)$$

Comparing (5.9) with (5.8), we see that we have two variables depending on time, M_A and

$$Y = M_B a^{-1} \quad . \quad (5.10)$$

Taking the derivative of (5.8) and inserting in (5.9),

$$M_A \dot{Y} + Y \dot{M}_A = c_d Y \dot{M}_A \quad . \quad (5.11)$$

This can be integrated to give

$$\ell n M_A = (c_d - 1)^{-1} \ell n Y + \text{const} \quad , \quad (5.12)$$

$$M_A \propto Y^{1/(c_d-1)} = Y^{1/5} \quad . \quad (5.13)$$

The final energy of the binary is then

$$E_f = \frac{1}{2} G M_{A_i} Y_i (Y_f/Y_i)^{6/5} \quad , \quad (5.14)$$

where the subscript i denotes the initial, f the final value of the respective quantities.

The binding energy E_f of star A to star B serves to expel the envelope of star B whose initial binding energy is given by equation (5.2). But it is believed that only a fraction of E_f can serve to expel the envelope, which is usually assumed to be one-half, hence

$$E_f = 1.2 G M_{B_i}^2 R^{-1} \quad (5.15)$$

is necessary to completely eject the envelope. In-spiral begins when R reaches a_i . In-spiral is fast compared to the expansion of the giant, therefore we set

$$R = a_i \quad . \quad (5.16)$$

Then (5.15) becomes

$$E_f = 1.2GM_{Bi}Y_i \quad . \quad (5.17)$$

Inserting into (5.14) yields

$$(Y_f/Y_i)^{1.2} = 2.4M_{Bi}/M_{Ai} \quad . \quad (5.18)$$

Star *A* is initially a neutron star, $M_{Ai} = 1.4$. For star *B*, we assume $M_{Bi} = 15$. Then (5.18) yields

$$Y_f/Y_i = 15 \quad . \quad (5.19)$$

We use this first to find the result of accretion, with the help of equation (5.13),

$$M_{Af}/M_{Ai} = 1.73 \quad , \quad (5.20)$$

$$M_{Af} = 2.4 \text{ M}_\odot \quad . \quad (5.21)$$

Star *A*, by accretion, has become a black hole. The lower limit for a black hole, according to the argument of Brown and Bethe (1994), is $M_{min} = 1.5 \text{ M}_\odot$. For the range $M_B = 10 - 20 \text{ M}_\odot$ the spread in M_{Af} is $2.25 - 2.5 \text{ M}_\odot$. To within a few percent accuracy $M_{Af}/M_{Ai} = (M_{Bi}/\text{M}_\odot)^{0.2}$, given the value we used for c_d .

Star *B*, by losing its envelope, becomes a He star. We estimate

$$M_{Bf}/M_{Bi} = 0.3 \quad . \quad (5.22)$$

The size of the orbit is determined by equation (5.10),

$$\frac{a_i}{a_f} = \frac{M_{Bi}}{M_{Bf}} \frac{Y_f}{Y_i} = 50 \quad . \quad (5.23)$$

The final distance between the stars, a_f , should not be less than about 10^{11} so that the black hole *A* is comfortably outside the He star *B*. On the other hand, if the two stars are to merge within a Hubble time, equation (7.9) shows that $a_f < 3.8 \times 10^{11}$. So the initial distance of the two stars, after the first mass exchange and the first supernova, should be

$$0.5 \times 10^{13} < a_i < 1.9 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm} \quad . \quad (5.24)$$

The assumption is made here that the final black–hole, neutron–star orbit has the same a as the a_f of the black–hole, He–star orbit. Whereas the former will open out somewhat in the explosion of the He star, it will generally be quite eccentric. On the average this leads to an $\sim 40\%$ increase in the a_f for merger (Lattimer, 1997), so there will be considerable cancellation between these neglected effects. (See our later eq. (7.10).)

If the initial distribution of distances is $da/7a$, the probability of finding a between the limits of equation (5.24), is

$$P = 18\% . \quad (5.25)$$

The probability of the binary surviving the first explosion was found in (2.15) to be 0.43, so the combined probability is

$$PW = 18 \times 0.43 = 7.7\% . \quad (5.26)$$

Strictly speaking, the calculation of (2.15) should be done with the orbital velocity limits corresponding to the limits of a_i in (5.24), which are

$$\begin{aligned} v_{max}^2 &= 7.3 \times 10^{14} (\text{cm s}^{-1})^2 \\ v_{min}^2 &= 2.0 \times 10^{14} (\text{cm s}^{-1})^2 . \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

The result is then

$$PW = 8\% , \quad (5.28)$$

essentially unchanged.

The survival probability of the final He star explosion, in the black–hole, He–star binary should be similar to that found by Wettig and Brown (1996) for He–star, neutron–star binaries,

$$P \simeq 50\% . \quad (5.29)$$

An important ingredient in this relatively high probability is the rather low mass of the He star before explosion. As is well known, the binary cannot stay together if its

total mass after explosion is less than half that before explosion. The after-explosion mass is $2.4 + 1.4 = 3.8 M_{\odot}$, so the He star mass before explosion must be less than $0.2 \times 3.8 - 2.4 = 5.2 M_{\odot}$. Once the He stars have lost their H envelopes they rapidly lose mass by wind, and those for the relevant ZAMS masses end up below $4 M_{\odot}$. For example, the initially $7 M_{\odot}$ star of Woosley, Langer and Weaver (1995) ends up at $3.2 M_{\odot}$ before explosion. Then if the SN kick is more or less opposite to the orbital velocity before explosion, the binary will stay together.

We now summarize the various factors entering into the black-hole, neutron star evolution:

$$R = 10^{-2} \times 0.50 \times 0.077 \times 0.5 = 1.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ per Galaxy per year .} \quad (5.30)$$

These factors follow from eqs. (2.7), (3.8), (5.26), (5.29). Because of our possible overestimates of binarity, of the number of systems that undergo Roche Lobe overflow, and other effects mentioned earlier, this may be somewhat too high. We feel that a reasonable lower limit is

$$R = 10^{-4} \text{ per Galaxy per year .} \quad (5.31)$$

In fact, our rate per supernova $(\alpha'/2 + \alpha + \alpha'') = 0.025$ per year is 0.004 to be compared with 0.0036 from Portegies Zwart and Yungelson (1998) who have a supernova rate of 0.015 per year. Thus, the chief difference between our result (5.31) and the $R = 5.3 \times 10^{-5}$ of these authors is due to the different assumed supernova rate. This shows that the many effects neglected in our calculations, but included in their detailed computer calculations are unimportant for the result.

Given our lower limit and the Wettig & Brown (1996) $P = 50\%$, we would have a rate of 2×10^{-4} per Galaxy per year for formation of black-hole, He-star binaries. Given an average He-star lifetime of 5×10^5 yrs, this would give ~ 100 black-hole, He-star systems in the Galaxy. This is not far from the estimate of van den Heuvel (1995) who obtains 60

neutron–star, He–star systems, with a lower limit of $2.5 M_{\odot}$ for the He–star mass. (With our lower limit of $2.2 M_{\odot}$ for the He stars which end up as neutron stars, his number would be $\gtrsim 50\%$ greater.) Van den Heuvel (1995) discusses reasons why only one such system, Cyg X–3, is seen. If, indeed, the neutron stars would not go into black holes, many of these neutron stars would be recycled by the He–star wind, and this would lead to an overproduction, by a large factor, of recycled binary pulsars. We avoid this overproduction problem by the neutron stars A going into black holes.

Ergma & Yungelson (1997) find by means of population synthesis the same number 100 of black–hole, helium–star binaries in the Galaxy as do we. However, their massive black holes arise directly from stars of ZAMS masses > 30 or $50 M_{\odot}$, whereas our low mass black holes evolve from in spiral in the hydrogen envelope of the compact object. (We have not evolved systems with massive black holes.) Ergma and Yungelson suggest a combination of reasons that, out of their many predicted systems, Cyg X–3 is the only example of such systems seen.

6. CASE II: STAR B A GIANT

6.1. Evolution of Binary Neutron Stars

Following hydrogen core burning, star B will expand in a red giant phase, which takes up $\geq 20\%$ of its lifetime. In the first half of the red giant phase the temperature in the center is not high enough to burn helium. The core undergoes contraction, raising its temperature. Because of the temperature increase also just outside of the core, shell hydrogen burning begins and the envelope expands modestly. For a star of ZAMS mass $16 M_{\odot}$ Bodenheimer and Taam (1984) find that the radius increases out to $\sim 4 \times 10^{12}$ cm. This first half of the red giant phase is not useful in this paper because if the neutron star

is met by the expanding giant envelope at $R < 0.5 \times 10^{13}$ cm, from condition (5.24) the neutron star will spiral into the core. Interestingly, we find that this occurs for all of the standard high mass X-ray binaries, such as SMC X-1, Cen X-3, LMC X-4, Vela X-1 and 4U1538–52. The widest of these, Vela X-1, has $a = 0.37 \times 10^{13}$ cm. Spiral-in for these objects has been found in many numerical calculations in the literature. In order to avoid spiral-in, we need binaries wider than the HMXB's.

Relevant for us is the next $\sim 10\%$ of the lifetime of the star, the period of helium core burning. During this (supergiant) stage the star expands out to several times 10^{13} cm. If the first born neutron star is to escape common-envelope evolution, then the two massive stars in the binary must burn helium at the same time. As we outline below, they can then expel their hydrogen envelopes while burning helium. The neutron star produced later then has no hydrogen envelope. As noted earlier, stellar evolutionary times go as M^{-2} , so that stars A and B must be within 5% of each other in mass, if they are to burn helium at the same time. However, if one star goes supernova, the other one will too. Thus, we have a rate of 0.05α (of eq. (2.7)) or $\sim 10\%$ of α' .

The fraction of these binaries with very nearly equal masses which survive spiral in will be roughly equal to the fraction of black holes which survive in our earlier discussion in §5, as we now argue.

If the two ZAMS masses are nearly equal, the two He stars tighten, expelling the common H envelope (Brown 1995). The binding energy of the H-envelope which results from the two initial H envelopes is ~ 4 times that of each individual envelope (see eq. (5.2)). If the He star were 4 times more massive than the compact object discussed in §5 in common envelope evolution, the final a_f would be the same as in §5. Since this is not far from being true, the He stars will end up at roughly the same a_f as found earlier for the black hole and companion B . In the explosion of the first He star, Wettig and Brown

(1996) found a survival probability of $\sim 50\%$, not far from the $\mathcal{W}$ of eq. (2.15). The survival probability in the explosion of the He star B in the He–star, neutron–star binary will be similar to that in the He–star, black–hole binary. Thus, we can say that $\sim 10\%$ of the original massive binaries will end up as binary pulsars. This same ratio to black–hole, neutron–star binaries holds for the probability of merging during a Hubble time. Given our rate of 10^{-4} per Galaxy per year for the latter binaries, we find 10^{-5} per Galaxy per year for binary neutron stars. This may be an upper limit because He stars with ZAMS masses $\leq 15 M_{\odot}$ expand in the He shell burning phase and give the companion neutron star another chance to go into a black hole (Brown 1997). Using unpublished evolutionary calculations of Woosley of He stars of mass $< 4 M_{\odot}$ (roughly corresponding to $15 M_{\odot}$ ZAMS) in which wind mass loss is included, Fryer and Kalogera (1997) show that only special conditions allow the pulsar in narrow neutron–star binaries to avoid the envelope of these low–mass He stars. Otherwise the pulsar accretes sufficient matter to go into a black hole, in much the same way as was more crudely described by Brown (1997). This implies that most of the narrow binaries evolved from He star masses $< 4 M_{\odot}$ in the double He–star scenario are low–mass black–hole, neutron–star binaries. Because of the much lower total mass in the He envelope, compared with the H one (In Habets (1986), who does not include wind mass loss, the entire envelope of a $2.5 M_{\odot}$ He star above the helium burning shell is $\sim 0.8 M_{\odot}$.), less mass will be accreted so that the black hole will be less massive than the $\sim 2.4 M_{\odot}$ of eq. (5.21). This will decrease our estimate of 10^{-5} per Galaxy per year for merging binary neutron stars, probably by a factor ~ 2 . This also adds a class, formed at about the same rate as binary neutron stars, of low–mass black–hole, neutron star binaries in which the black hole is not much more massive than the neutron star. Again, our rate is in good agreement with the 0.7×10^{-5} found by Portegies Zwart and Yungelson (1998) in their detailed computer evolution.

Note that our 10^{-5} per year per Galaxy is essentially the same as the $\sim 8 \times 10^{-6}$ of

van den Heuvel and Lorimer (1996). These authors increased their estimated number of binary pulsars which might be observed by a beaming factor of 3 and a factor of 10 because 90% are estimated to be unobservable (Curran and Lorimer, 1995). This factor of 30 is somewhat uncertain, so it may be useful that we arrive at essentially the same rate directly from an evolutionary calculation.

For very nearly equal initial masses ($q \sim 1$) the mass transfer is conservative. In this case, from angular momentum transfer, we can deduce that

$$\frac{a_f}{a_i} = \left(\frac{\mu_i}{\mu_f} \right)^2 \quad (6.1)$$

where

$$\mu = M_A M_B / (M_A + M_B) . \quad (6.2)$$

Since $\mu_f < \mu_i$, the final μ_f being slightly smaller than M_{Af} , the He core mass in A , the orbits open out in conservative mass transfer. The main effect of this is to shift the logarithmic interval of given binaries outwards. But the magnitude of the logarithmic interval is unchanged, so is (by our assumption) the number of binaries.

Note that if $q \sim 1$ initially, the initial near equality of He core masses of A and B will not be changed by the mass transfer. Star B will not be rejuvenated by the transferred H-envelope from A because there is not time to cross the molecular weight barrier and convert the transferred H to He (Braun and Langer, 1995). Thus, the near equality in He-star masses in a given binary is conserved. This will lead to nearly equal neutron star masses in a binary, except for a small correction from the accretion by the first neutron star formed from the wind of its He-star companion (Brown, 1995). This explains why the neutron star masses in a given binary tend to be nearly equal. (In the standard scenario of evolution, where star B is rejuvenated by mass transfer, the companion neutron star B tends to be more massive than the pulsar A . This is the result found in the calculations of Portegies Zwart (1997)).

7. GRAVITATIONAL WAVES

In §5 and 6 we have described how various types of compact binaries are formed. Once formed, they are subject to emission of gravitational waves, as was demonstrated by Taylor and Hulse. Shapiro and Teukolsky (1983) discuss gravitational waves in their chapter 16, and give a simple formula for the time required for a merger of the two stars in their eq. (16.4.10),

$$T = \frac{5}{256} \frac{c^5}{G^3 M^2 \mu} R^4 . \quad (7.1)$$

where $M = M_A + M_B$ and

$$\mu = \frac{M_A M_B}{M_A + M_B} . \quad (7.2)$$

The masses here are the masses after both stars have become compact.

We are interested in the maximum initial distance permitted for the two stars to merge in a Hubble time which we take to be

$$T_H = 10^{10} \text{ yr} . \quad (7.3)$$

Then

$$R_{\max}^4 = 6.4 \frac{M_A M_B (M_A + M_B)}{M_\odot^3} R_{Sh}^3 c T_H , \quad (7.4)$$

where

$$R_{Sh} = \frac{2GM_\odot}{c^2} = 3.0 \text{ km} \quad (7.5)$$

is the Schwarzschild radius of the sun.

Then

$$R_{\max}^4 = R_O^4 \frac{M_A M_B (M_A + M_B)}{M_\odot^3} \quad (7.6)$$

$$R_O^4 = 1.6 \times 10^{25} \text{ km}^4 . \quad (7.7)$$

Taking the masses of Case I, §5,

$$M_A = 2.4 M_\odot , \quad M_B = 1.4 M_\odot \quad (7.8)$$

we get

$$R_{\max} = 3.8 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm} \approx 5R_{\odot} \quad . \quad (7.9)$$

But we have shown in §5 that after expulsion of the envelope, the distance between the two stars may be as low as $1 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}$ in which case the stars will merge in a small fraction of the Hubble time. The same is true of the Hulse-Taylor binary, as is well known.

As noted following eq. (5.24), eccentricity in the final low-mass black-hole neutron-star binary leads to an a_f substantially larger than the $3.8 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}$ for merger of eq. (7.9). In general most of the final binaries will have $e > 0.5$, with a rapid rise just before $e = 1$. The rise results because preservation of the binary in the explosion is substantially greater if the kick velocity is opposite to the orbital velocity before explosion. In this case the eccentricity e is large. the most favorable situation is when the orbital and kick velocities are equal in magnitude. (See the figures in Wettig and Brown, 1996.) Eggleton (1998) has kindly furnished us with a useful interpolation formula for the increase. The factor to multiply the T of eq. (7.1), which refers to circular orbits, is

$$Z(e) \approx (1 - e^2)^{3.689 - 0.243e - 0.058e^2} \quad . \quad (7.10)$$

This formula is accurate to about 1% for $e \leq 0.99$. Thus if the initial eccentricity is 0.7 the time to shrink the orbit to zero is about 10% of the time required if the initial eccentricity were zero, for the same initial period. The maximum $a_f = 3.8 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}$ for circular orbits would be increased by the fourth root of the decrease in time; i.e., up to $6.8 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}$ for this eccentricity. The maximum a_i in eq. (5.24) would go up to $3.4 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}$, increasing the favorable logarithmic interval by $\sim 40\%$.

We wish to carry out a complete calculation of the distribution of eccentricities using the computer program of Wettig and Brown (1996) before assigning a definite number to the increase due to eccentricity. Note that this will affect our low-mass black-hole neutron star, neutron star binaries in the same way, leaving the ratio nearly unchanged. We note

that Bloom, Sigurdsson and Pols (1998), modifying the code created for binary evolution by Pols and Eggleton (cf. Pols 1994 and references therein) find an extremely low medium merging time of 2.1 million years for binary neutron stars. This is more than two orders of magnitude smaller than the merging times of the narrow binaries 1913+16 and 1534+12, used to make estimates of the rate of mergers from observation. These binary neutron stars with very short lifetimes have understandably not been observed, but should be added in estimates made from observation, such as those of van den Heuvel and Lorimer (1996).

8. “OBSERVABILITY PENALTIES” FOR BLACK–HOLE, NEUTRON–STAR BINARIES

With two supernovas per century, the formation rate of single pulsars is $\sim 1.25 \times 10^{-2}$ per year per Galaxy. In fact, including binaries as noted following eq. (5.31) our total supernova rate is 0.025 per year. However, in only $\sim 1/2$ of these cases is a neutron star formed, ZAMS masses $\gtrsim 18 M_{\odot}$ evolving into black holes according to the Brown and Bethe (1994) scenario. (We believe that SN(1987)A evolved into a low mass black hole.) The single pulsar formation rate of $\sim 1.25 \times 10^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ would seem to be the population with which our black–hole, neutron–star binaries should be compared, since the neutron star in both cases is unrecycled. With a rate for the black–hole, neutron–star binaries of 10^{-4} per year per Galaxy, one would see several of these latter objects were this to be true.

As noted in §5a. the binarity in neutron–star, O, B–binaries seems to severely inhibit observability, and it was suggested that these binaries generally cannot get out of the Galactic disc where their radio signals will be distorted by the dense matter.

The Hulse–Taylor pulsar is not far above the Galactic plane, at $z = 0.26 \text{ kpc}$. (Roughly half of the single pulsars are below this z , $\sim$ half above.) The Wolszczan 1534 is at high

$z = 0.51$ kpc and the recently discovered 1518+49 is at 0.57 kpc, both high. Both of these are very old, with estimated ages of 250 and 16,000 Myr. In all of these pulsars the magnetic field is low, $\sim 10^{10}$ G, so their spindown times are about two orders of magnitude greater than those of fresh pulsars. The unrecycled binary 2303+46 is at high $z = 0.91$ kpc, somewhat of a mystery. According to our estimates of production rate of 10^{-2} for single pulsars, and 10^{-5} for binary pulsars, with the latter corrected by a factor ~ 100 for longer observability, one might expect to see ~ 70 binaries, given ~ 700 single pulsars. Curran and Lorimer (1995), assuming the shape of the NS–NS luminosity function is similar to that of normal pulsars, suggest that $\sim 90\%$ of these binary pulsars are missed in current pulsar surveys. This would remove most of the discrepancy noted above. Pulsars in the galactic plane are difficult to observe because the plane is full of dust and electrons which absorb or scatter electromagnetic radiation. This applies to single as well as binary pulsars. The difference is, however, that pulsars in a binary have greater difficulty in getting out of the galactic plane. We suggest there is an “observability penalty” which results from binary pulsars moving more slowly out of the disc than single neutron stars because of their higher mass. This “penalty” would be greater for our black–hole, neutron–star systems, because they are more massive.

Furthermore, our black–hole, neutron–star binaries will generally be narrow, with periods of $\sim 2 - 18$ hrs., more at the low end because of the a^{-1} distribution of binaries. Acceleration of the neutron star in its orbit in the binary will make it harder to find the signal by Fourier analysis.

We have not been able to quantify these “penalties”, and offer the above as only suggestions.

9. CONCLUSION

We believe that at least 1% of massive binaries survive as binaries to ultimate merger. Taking the rate of supernovas in binaries to be one per century per Galaxy, we find a merger rate of 10^{-4} per year per Galaxy, one order of magnitude higher than believed before.

The most important assumption for this conclusion is that the semi-major axes of binaries of heavy main-sequence stars are distributed as da/a , and that this distribution extends out to $a = 2 \times 10^8$ km (even further once eccentricity in the final binaries is taken into account), or orbital periods as long as 100 days (eq. (5.24)).

We suggest that most of the mergings, leading to gravitational waves, will be those of black-hole, neutron-star binaries, rather than binary neutron stars. Earlier estimates are that the latter contribute $\sim 10^{-5}$ per year per Galaxy. In our evolutionary scenario the binary neutron star systems result only from those cases in which the first born neutron star can escape the common envelope evolution which otherwise sends it into a black hole. This can be realized if stars A and B are within $\sim 5\%$ of each other in mass. Simple arguments show that this should result in $\sim 10\%$ of the binaries, and scaling arguments show that about the same proportion of these selected binaries survive spiral in and end up close enough to merge as in the black-hole, neutron-star estimates. The ten times higher rate for black-hole, neutron-star mergers results, then, from the $\sim 90\%$ of “failed” binary pulsar evolutions. This ratio is robust, given our results for the accretion onto the neutron star in the common envelope.

The reason for our high merger rate, 10^{-4} , is that only a moderate fraction of binaries get lost between the first supernova and the gravitational merger. In $\sim 50\%$ of the cases, the second star B is heavy enough to end up in a supernova. About 40% survive the first supernova without splitting the binary. A small fraction is split by the second supernova kick. And another small fraction are lost because their separation, after both supernova

events, is too great to permit merger by gravitational wave emission within a Hubble time.

A direct comparison with computer evolution is with case H of Portegies Zwart and Yungelson (1998). As noted following Eq. (5.31) and in our section on the evolution of binary pulsars, both for the latter and for black–hole, neutron–star binaries, agreement between our simple analytical evolution and their detailed numerical calculations is good, $\lesssim$ factor of 2 in the final results. With the same assumptions as to rate of supernovas they would be closer and, most importantly, our ratio of black–hole, neutron–star mergings to binary neutron–star mergings is nearly the same as theirs, 10. This indicates that the many detailed effects left out; *e.g.*, widening of the orbits with mass exchange, are unimportant. We believe that our analytical work lends credence to the numerical work, and *vice versa*. It is much easier to assess changes that different effects would produce, so we believe it worthwhile to have our simpler evolution.

Case H with inclusion of hypercritical accretion was only one of 8 cases studied by Portegies Zwart and Yungelson (1998). They remark that this case fails to reproduce the short period binary pulsars. However, inclusion of the Wettig and Brown (1996) “observability premium”, which is now underway by Portegies Zwart, should improve this.

In the standard scenario studied by Portegies Zwart and Yungelson, without hypercritical accretion, masses of the pulsar progenitor come out substantially less than those of the companion progenitor (Portegies Zwart, private communication). This is easily understood by rejuvenation of the companion following the initial mass transfer to it. This is contrary to observation where the pulsar is more massive than the companion neutron star in 1913+16 and the two are nearly equal in mass in 1534+12. The near equality in masses follows from our double He star scenario, the somewhat greater pulsar mass in 1913+16 pinning down the progenitor mass (Brown, 1997).

A partial comparison can be made with Iben, Tutukov, and Yungelson (1995) who

used an extensive numerical scenario program developed at the Institute of Astronomy in Moscow several years ago to carry out in much more detail than we the evolution of binary compact objects. Iben, *et al.* obtain a rate of 3×10^{-4} per year for merging neutron stars. With inclusion of hypercritical accretion in the common envelope evolution, 90% of these would become merging black-hole, neutron star binaries, to be compared with our rate of 1.9×10^{-4} per year (our eq. (5.30)).

Their birth rate for HMXB’s (our neutron star with massive companion) is 2.6×10^{-3} per year. Our rate is $10^{-2} \times 0.58 \times 0.43 = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$, with inclusion of kicks. Their other results are difficult to compare with ours, because of different basic assumptions.

Wettig and Brown (1996) suggested an “observability premium” for the longer spindown time of binary pulsars once their magnetic field had been brought down (by accretion from the He-star wind during the He-star, neutron-star stage in the Wettig and Brown evolution). We suggest an “observability penalty” for the higher mass in our black-hole, neutron-star binaries. This results from their greater difficulty, due to their higher mass, to get out of the Galactic disc. In the latter, they are more difficult to observe. Still, we believe some of our black-hole, neutron-star binaries should be observable, and we hope that our work is a challenge to observers.

Our results should be very important for LIGO. At the same time, LIGO becomes very essential for testing our ideas about massive binaries:

Our rates in the Galaxy of 10^{-4} yr^{-1} for³ BH/NS binaries and 10^{-5} yr^{-1} for NS/NS extrapolate to rates per unit volume in the universe of $8 \times 10^{-7} \text{ Mpc}^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for BH/NS, and

³Here and in the following BH means low-mass black hole. We are presently preparing a paper which estimates the rate for high-mass black-hole, neutron-star binaries such as would result from Cyg X-1.

$8 \times 10^{-8} \text{Mpc}^{-3} \text{yr}^{-1}$ for NS/NS (Phinney, 1991); which means that to see one event per year, LIGO must look out to a distance of 70Mpc for BH/NS and 150Mpc for NS/NS.

Because of their larger masses, the BH/NS binaries can be seen farther by LIGO than the NS/NS binaries. Kip Thorne informs us that LIGO's first long gravitational-wave search in 2002–2003 is expected to see BH/NS (assuming masses of 2.4 and $1.4M_{\odot}$) to a distance of about 35Mpc (too short by a factor 2 according to our lower limit (5.31)), and NS/NS to 25Mpc (too short by a factor 6). However, enhancements of the initial LIGO interferometers, planned for 2004, should reach out beyond 70Mpc for BH/NS, bringing them into view; and other planned enhancements should reach NS/NS soon thereafter; cf. Thorne (1998).

LIGO will measure each binary's chirp mass $M_{\text{chirp}} = \mu^{3/5} M^{2/5}$ to an accuracy of a few tenths of a percent (Poisson and Will, 1995). We predict a bimodal distribution for these measurements: The BH/NS systems should display chirp masses concentrated near $1.7M_{\odot}$; the NS/NS systems should concentrate near $1.2M_{\odot}$. We predict a ratio of event rates in LIGO of about 30 of the heavier systems for each of lighter one (a factor 10 from rate per unit volume; a factor 3 from seeing BH/NS farther than NS/NS).

Mergers of binary neutron stars and black-hole, neutron stars have been considered in many papers as progenitors for gamma-ray bursters. If one of the neutron stars in the former does not collapse into a black hole, the radiated neutrinos will deposit their energy in lifting baryons from the strong gravitational potential instead of powering a relativistically expanding pair-plasma fireball. This can be avoided if one of the compact objects is a black hole, in which case baryons drop through the event horizon carrying their binding energy with them (Ruffert and Janka, 1998). This leaves a low baryon contamination of the fireball, which cannot be larger than $\sim 10^{-5} M_{\odot}$. The black hole must be of mass less than $5 M_{\odot}$; otherwise the neutron star would be swallowed before disruption (Rees, 1997). Our

many low-mass black-hole, neutron-star binaries offer a heretofore unexpected number of possible progenitors.

The authors would like to thank Simon F. Portegies Zwart for many useful discussions and for providing them with unpublished material. We thank Lev Yungelson for correspondence and for sending us the Ergma, Yungelson paper in advance of publication. We are also grateful to C.-H. Lee for using the Wettig and Brown (1996) code to check a number of analytical calculations. We would like to thank Zaven Arzoumanian and Steve Thorsett for much advice about observability, and David Chernoff for giving us the results of Cordes and Chernoff (1997) long before publication. One of us (G.E.B.) is grateful to Madappa Prakash for many helpful conversations. Jim Lattimer checked many of our calculations and gave many helpful criticisms. G.E.B. was partially supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under grant No. DE-FG02-88ER40388. Kip Thorne helped us to relate our results more quantitatively to LIGO. We are grateful to Peter Eggleton for advice on the distribution of massive binaries and for the interpolation formula (7.10) for the effect of eccentricity.

REFERENCES

- Applegate, J. H. 1997 Columbia Univ. Preprint
- Bloom, J. S., Sigurdsson, S., & Pols, O. R. 1998, MNRAS, to be published
- Bodenheimer, P., & Taam, R. E. 1984, ApJ, 280, 771
- Braun, H., & Langer, N. 1995, A&A, 297, 771
- Brown, G. E. 1995, ApJ, 440, 270
- Brown, G. E. 1997, Phys. Bl., 53, 671
- Brown, G. E., & Bethe, H. A. 1994, ApJ, 423, 659
- Cordes, J. M., & Chernoff, D. F. 1997 Cornell Preprint
- Curran, S. J., & Lorimer, D. R. 1995, MNRAS, 276, 347
- Eggleton, P. 1998, private communication
- Ergma, E., & Yungelson, L. R. 1997, A&A, to be published
- Fryer, C., & Kalogera, V. 1997, ApJ, 489, 244
- Garmany, C. D., Conti, P. S., & Massey, P. 1980, apJ, 242, 1063
- Habets, G. M. H. J. 1986, A&A, 165, 95
- Iben, I., & Livio, M. 1993, PASP 105, 1373
- Iben, I., Tutukov, A. V., & Yungelson, L. R. 1995, ApJSS, 55, 100, 217
- Lattimer, J. M. 1997, private communication
- Phinney, E. S. 1991, ApJL, 380, L17
- Poisson, E., & Will, C. M. 1995, Phys. Rev. D, 52, 848
- Pols, O. R. 1994, A&A, 290, 119
- Portegies Zwart, S. F. 1997, private communication
- Portegies Zwart, S. F. & Verbunt, F. 1995, A&A, 309, 179
- Portegies Zwart, S. F. & Yungelson, L. R. 1998, A&A, to be published
- Rees, M. J. 1997, astro-phy/9701162
- Ruffert, M., & Janka, H.-J. 1998, Proc. 4th Huntsville Gamma-Ray Burst Symposium,

- Huntsville, Alabama, Sept. 15–20, 1997. AIP Conf. Proc., eds. Meegan, C. A., & Cushman, P., AIP, New York
- Shapiro, S. L., & Teukolsky, S. A. 1983, *Black Holes, White Dwarfs and Neutron Stars*, John Wiley & Sons, New York
- Shima, E., Matsuda, T., Takeda, H., & Sawada, K. 1985, MNRAS, 217, 367
- Thorne, K. S. 1998, in *Black Holes and Relativistic Stars*, ed. Wald, R. M., University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Van den Heuvel, E. P. J. 1995, J. Astrophys. Astr., 16, 255
- Van den Heuvel, E. P. J., & Lorimer, D. R. 1996, MNRAS, 283, L37
- Vrancken, J., DeGreve, J. P., Yungelson, L., & Tutukov, A. 1991, A&A, 249, 411
- Weaver, T. A., Zimmerman, G. B., & Woosley, S. E. 1978, ApJ, 225, 1021
- Wettig, T., & Brown, G. E. 1996 New Astron., 1, 17
- Woosley, S. E., Langer, N., & Weaver, T. A. 1995, ApJ, 448, 315

TABLE CAPTIONS

TABLE 1. NOTE.– Mass of star B after mass transfer, $f(q) = M_{B1}/M_{AO}$. Fraction $g(q)$ of main sequence accomplished by B when A has finished its MS. $1.25q^2$ is shown for comparison with $g(q)$.

TABLE 1

q	$f(q)$	$g(q)$	$1.25q^2$
0.95	1.582	1.153	1.128
0.9	1.467	1.025	1.012
0.89	1.444	1.001	0.990
0.85	1.356	0.906	0.903
0.8	1.248	0.796	0.800
0.7	1.043	0.599	0.613
0.6	0.852	0.433	0.450
0.5	0.675	0.296	0.313
0.3	0.363	0.103	0.112
0.1	0.107	0.011	0.013